UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,846	03/30/2004	Jonathan J. Hull	20412-08382	6504

758 7590 06/22/2007

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
THOMPSON, JAMES A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/814,846	HULL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James A. Thompson	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *3/30/2004 to 4/27/2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :12/27/04,10/31/05,1/24/06,4/17/06,10/2/06,11/6/06, 2/2/07,4/27/07.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. **Claims 42-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claims 42-46 and 49-52 each recite the limitation "The method of claim 1" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 47 and 48 are rejected based on their dependencies from claim 46.

3. **Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the serial interface" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examining the claims over prior art, Examiner will assume that Applicant intended to have claim 14 depend from claim 13, since claim 13 contains the antecedent basis for "the serial interface" recited in claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-3, 8-9, 18, 23, 26-27, 35, 40, 43 and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723).**

Regarding claim 1: Sugiyama discloses a system for printing multimedia data (figure 1 of Sugiyama), the system comprising: an interface (figure 1(11) of Sugiyama) for receiving a multimedia data from a peripheral device (column 3, lines 11-16 of Sugiyama); and a multimedia processing system (figure 1(12,15,21-25) of Sugiyama) coupled to the interface (as can clearly be

seen in figure 1 of Sugiyama) to receive the multimedia (column 3, lines 16-26 of Sugiyama), the multimedia processing system performing a multimedia function on the multimedia data (figure 4 and column 4, line 43 to column 5, line 11 of Sugiyama), wherein the multimedia processing system resides at least in part on the system (elements 12,15 and 21-25 all reside on the system of figure 1 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 2: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia function comprises determining an electronic representation of the multimedia data (figure 4 and column 5, lines 2-7 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 3: Sugiyama discloses a first output device (figure 1(20) of Sugiyama) in communication with the multimedia processing system to receive the electronic representation (column 3, lines 31-41 of Sugiyama), the first output device producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the multimedia data (column 5, lines 5-7 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 8: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia function comprises determining a printed representation of the multimedia data (figure 4 and column 5, lines 7-11 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 9: Sugiyama discloses a second output device (figure 1(31-33) of Sugiyama) in communication with the multimedia processing system to receive the printed representation, the second output device producing a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the multimedia data (figure 4 and column 5, line 63 to column 6, line 5 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 18: Sugiyama discloses that the interface comprises a video port (figure 1("Video Signal") and column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claims 23 and 43: Sugiyama discloses that the media source comprises a video camcorder (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 26: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia function comprises processing a video stream (column 3, lines 26-32 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 27: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia function comprises extracting a key frame from a video stream (column 3, lines 20-29 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 35: Sugiyama discloses receiving a multimedia data from a peripheral device (column 3, lines 11-16 of Sugiyama); performing a multimedia function on the multimedia data (figure 4 and column 4, line 43 to column 5, line 11 of Sugiyama); determining an electronic representation of the multimedia data (figure 4 and column 5, lines 2-7 of Sugiyama); and

producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the multimedia data (column 5, lines 5-7 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 40: Sugiyama discloses determining a printed representation of the multimedia data (figure 4 and column 5, lines 7-11 of Sugiyama); and producing a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the multimedia data (figure 4 and column 5, line 63 to column 6, line 5 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 46: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia function comprises processing a video stream (column 3, lines 11-26 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 47: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia function comprises extracting a key frame from a video stream (column 3, lines 20-29 of Sugiyama).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-5, 10, 36-37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Wendelken (US Patent 6,193,658 B1).

Regarding claims 4 and 36: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the electronic output is stored on a media recorder.

Wendelken discloses storing an electronic output on a media recorder (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the electronic output on a media recorder, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to keep a permanent record of the video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4 and 36.

Regarding claims 5 and 37: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the electronic output is stored on a removable storage device.

Wendelken discloses storing an electronic output on a removable storage device (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Video tapes and optical discs are clearly removable storage devices.

Sugiyama is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the electronic output on a removable storage device, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to keep a permanent record of the video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Further, as is well-known in the art, using a *removable* storage device allows a user to switch recording devices, thus increasing the overall amount of data that can be stored and archived. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 37.

Regarding claims 10 and 41: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the printed output is generated on a video paper.

Wendelken discloses generating a printed output on video paper (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically use video paper for the output print, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been that video paper is one of several useful means for generating a permanent record of video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10 and 41.

8. Claims 6 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Wendelken (US Patent 6,193,658 B1), Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1), and Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1).

Further regarding claims 6 and 38: Wendelken discloses that said removable storage device (taught by Wendelken in the arguments regarding claims 6 and 44 above) is selected from one of a video tape and an optical disc (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama in view of Wendelken does not disclose expressly that the optical disc can specifically be either a DVD or a CD-ROM. Thus, Wendelken does not disclose expressly that the group from which said removable storage device is selected consists of not only a video tape, but also a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a flash card, a memory stick, and a computer disk.

Hymel discloses a removable storage device selected from among a video tape (as is well-known in the art, a digital camcorder uses a digital video (DV) cassette tape) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel), a DVD (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD-ROM (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), an audio cassette tape (audio cassette tape reader is a type of audio player, MP3 player is merely an example) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel), and a computer disk (para. 19, lines 8-9 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Wendelken is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a video cassette tape, a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, and a computer disk. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Wendelken.

Sugiyama in view of Wendelken and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a video tape, and a computer disk, but also a flash card and a memory stick.

Shieh discloses removable storage devices including a flash card (para. 18, lines 1-5 of Shieh) and a memory stick (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Wendelken and Hymel is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a flash card and a memory stick, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to output data to one of a plurality of different output devices, depending upon user need and desire (para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama in view of Wendelken and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6 and 38.

9. Claims 7, 29, 39 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Huberman (US Patent 6,115,718).

Regarding claims 7 and 39: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the electronic output comprises a web page.

Huberman discloses generating a web page as an electronic output of multimedia data (column 3, lines 30-38 of Huberman). For a web page to exist with multimedia data (column 3, lines 30-38 of Huberman), it is inherent that said web page is generated. Otherwise, said web page would not exist.

Sugiyama is combinable with Huberman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a web page as an electronic output of multimedia data, as taught by Huberman. The suggestion for doing so would have been that storing data on the world wide web allows a company, educational institution, or other entity to publicly store and allow others to access digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Huberman with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 39.

Regarding claims 29 and 49: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the multimedia function comprises generating a web page representation of the multimedia data.

Huberman discloses generating a web page representation of multimedia data (column 3, lines 30-38 of Huberman). For a web page to exist with multimedia data (column 3, lines 30-38 of Huberman), it is inherent that said web page is generated. Otherwise, said web page would not exist.

Sugiyama is combinable with Huberman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a web page representation of the multimedia data, as taught by Huberman. The suggestion for doing so would have been that storing data on the world wide web allows a company, educational institution, or other entity to publicly store and allow others to access digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Huberman with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 29 and 49.

10. Claims 11, 13-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1).

Regarding claim 11: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises a parallel port.

Shieh discloses as part of the background an input interface that comprises a parallel port (para. 5, lines 7-8 of Shieh).

Sugiyama is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a parallel port for inputting the video data at said interface. The motivation for doing so would have been that parallel ports are compatible with flash card readers and the older 12 Mbit/sec computer equipment (para. 5, lines 1-9 of Shieh). Thus, using a parallel port is useful if older video and/or computer equipment is being used. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Regarding claims 13-14: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises a serial interface, wherein the serial interface is an USB interface.

Shieh discloses an interface comprising a serial interface, wherein the serial interface is an USB interface (figure 2 and para. 17, lines 12-15 of Shieh).

Sugiyama is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a USB interface for inputting the video data at the interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an increased data transfer rate, as compared with the older types of data transfer ports (para. 5, lines 7-12 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13-14.

Regarding claim 20: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises a removable storage reader.

Shieh discloses an interface comprising a removable storage reader (para. 17, lines 1-3 of Shieh).

Sugiyama is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a removable storage reader as part of the

interface, as taught by Shieh. The suggestion for doing so would have been that flash memory is applicable to various digital products (para. 5, lines 12-14 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Stevens (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0010641 A1).

Regarding claim 12: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises a wireless communication interface.

Stevens discloses an video data interface comprising a wireless communication interface (figure 3(110) and para. 36, lines 1-8 of Stevens).

Sugiyama is combinable with Stevens because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a wireless communication interface as said interface, as taught by Stevens. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to retrieve desired distributions of audio and video data over a controlled broadcast (para. 4, lines 1-5 of Stevens). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stevens with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

12. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Leman (US Patent 5,436,792).

Regarding claims 15-16: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises a docking station that is built into the system.

Leman discloses a docking station (column 3, lines 31-38 of Leman) that is built into the system (column 5, lines 53-61 of Leman).

Sugiyama is combinable with Leman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of digital data output and flow. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a docking station built into the system, as taught by Leman, as part of the interface taught by Sugiyama. The motivation for doing so would have been that a docking station provides ease of connection and disconnection with external devices and peripherals (column 2, lines 6-11 of Leman). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Leman with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 15-16.

13. Claims 17, 22, 24, 42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1).

Regarding claim 17: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises an optical port.

Hymel discloses an interface that comprises an optical (infrared) port (para. 10, lines 13-14 of Hymel).

Sugiyama is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use an optical port as part of said interface. The suggestion for doing so would have been that an optical port is one of many types of useful data ports for transferring digital data (para. 10, lines 3-14 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Regarding claims 22 and 42: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the media source comprises a cellular phone.

Hymel discloses a media source comprising a cellular phone (para. 10, lines 3-5 and lines 14-15 of Hymel).

Sugiyama is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a cellular phone as the media source. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a cellular phone is one of many types of useful media data input devices that can be used (para. 10, lines 14-22 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 22 and 42.

Regarding claims 24 and 44: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the media source comprises a digital audio recorder.

Hymel discloses a media source comprising a digital audio recorder (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel).

Sugiyama is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a digital audio recorder as the media source. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user

to connect another one of a variety of different types of peripheral devices, thus allowing the user to perform one more of a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 24 and 44.

14. Claims 19, 30-32 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Dygert (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0048224 A1).

Regarding claim 19: Sugiyama discloses that the interface comprises a port for connecting to the peripheral device, the port selected from a group including composite video (luminance and chrominance signals) (column 3, lines 16-20 of Sugiyama) and component video (NTSC) (column 3, lines 12-14 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only composite video and component video, but also of SCSI, IDE, RJ11 and S-video.

Dygert discloses a port for connecting a peripheral device selected from one of SCSI (para. 50, lines 1-5 of Dygert), IDE (para. 50, lines 1-5 of Dygert), RJ11 (para. 27, lines 6-9 of Dygert) and S-video (para. 50, lines 9-15 of Dygert).

Sugiyama is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to be able to further select between SCSI, IDE, RJ11 and S-video ports. The suggestion for doing so would have been that said ports are among some of the many available types of ports for transferring time-based multimedia data (para. 27, lines 3-9 and para. 50, lines 1-6 of Dygert). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Regarding claim 30: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the multimedia processing system is configured to communicate with the media source.

Dygert discloses a multimedia processing system (figure 1(10) of Dygert) that communicates with a media source (figure 1(13); and para. 44, lines 1-2, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert).

Sugiyama is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the multimedia processing system communicatively interact with the media source, as taught by

Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30.

Regarding claims 31 and 50: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the multimedia processing system is configured to control functionality in the peripheral device.

Dygert discloses a multimedia processing system (figure 1(10) of Dygert) that controls functionality of the media source (para. 44, lines 1-15 of Dygert).

Sugiyama is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the multimedia processing system communicatively interact with the media source, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 31 and 50.

Regarding claim 32: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the multimedia processing system resides at least in part on the peripheral device.

Dygert discloses performing multimedia processing operations on the peripheral device (para. 44, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert). Thus, the multimedia processing system resides at least in part on the peripheral device.

Sugiyama is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to operate the multimedia processing system at least partly on the peripheral device, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 32.

15. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1), Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1), and Gerber (US Patent 5,568,406).

Further regarding claim 21: Shieh discloses that the removable storage reader comprises a media reader selected from a group, wherein two of said group is a flash card reader (para. 16, lines 1-3 of Shieh) and a memory stick reader (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only a flash card reader, and a memory stick reader, but also a DVD reader, a CD reader, a computer disk reader, and an SD reader.

Hymel discloses a removable storage reader selected from among a DVD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), and a computer disk reader (para. 19, lines 8-9 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a DVD reader, a CD reader, and a computer disk reader, as taught by Hymel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Shieh.

Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD reader, a flash card reader, a memory stick reader, a CD reader, and a computer disk reader, but also of an SD reader.

Gerber discloses storing digital data on an SD disk (column 10, lines 28-34 of Gerber).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel is combinable with Gerber because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection an SD disk. The motivation for doing so would have been that an SD disk is useful for backing up large amounts of digital data (column 10, lines 23-34 of Gerber). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gerber with Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

16. Claims 25 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1), Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1), and Heilweil (US Patent 4,881,135).

Regarding claims 25 and 45: Sugiyama discloses that the media source comprises a media input selected from a group of a video cassette tape reader (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama), and a video capture device (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a video cassette tape reader and a video capture device, but also of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a flash card reader, a digital video recorder, and a meeting recorder.

Shieh discloses inputting digital media using a flash card reader (para. 16, lines 1-3 of Shieh).

Sugiyama is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control and storage of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a flash card reader, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to input data to one of a plurality of different input devices, depending upon user need and desire (para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama.

Sugiyama in view of Shieh does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a video cassette tape reader, a video capture device, and a flash card reader, but also of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a digital video recorder, and a meeting recorder.

Hymel discloses a media input device selected from among a DVD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), an audio cassette tape reader (audio cassette tape reader is a type of audio player, MP3 player is merely an example) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel), and a digital video recorder (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, and a digital video recorder, as taught by Hymel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a

variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Shieh.

Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a video cassette tape reader, a video capture device, a flash card reader, and a digital video recorder, but also of a meeting recorder.

Heilweil discloses media input using a meeting recorder (figure 2 and column 3, lines 48–51 of Heilweil).

Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel is combinable with Heilweil because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection the meeting recorder taught by Heilweil. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide audio-visual data regarding a conference or a meeting in a concealed or discreet manner (column 2, lines 33-40 of Heilweil). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Heilweil with Sugiyama in view of Shieh and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 25 and 45.

17. Claims 28 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Ohnishi (US Patent 4,807,186).

Regarding claim 26: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system generates digital printed data (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama) corresponding to a video segment in the video stream (column 3, lines 26-32 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that said digital printed data is specifically a bar code.

Ohnishi discloses printing digital data as a bar code (column 2, lines 56-60 of Ohnishi).

Sugiyama is combinable with Ohnishi because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to print a video segment in the video stream, as taught by Sugiyama, as a bar code, as taught by Ohnishi. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a bar code is one of the convenient means by which digital data is stored and later read (column 2,lines 56-62 of Ohnishi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Ohnishi with Sugiyama in view of to obtain the invention as specified in claims 28 and 48.

18. Claims 33-34 and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Schroath (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0169849).

Regarding claims 33 and 51: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the system is configured to automatically detect a communicative coupling of the peripheral device.

Schroath discloses automatically detecting a communicative coupling of a peripheral device (para. 38, lines 14-18 of Schroath).

Sugiyama is combinable with Schroath because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the system taught by Sugiyama to automatically detect a communicative coupling of the peripheral device, as taught by Schroath. The motivation for doing so would have been that, by using an automatic detection, digital data can be downloaded without querying the user (para. 38, lines 14–18 of Schroath), thus providing greater convenience for the user and faster downloads for required digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schroath with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 33 and 51.

Regarding claims 34 and 52: Sugiyama does not disclose expressly that the system is configured to automatically download multimedia data from the peripheral device.

Schroath discloses automatically downloading digital data from a peripheral device (para. 38, lines 14-18 of Schroath).

Sugiyama is combinable with Schroath because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the system taught by Sugiyama to automatically download digital data from the peripheral device, as taught by Schroath, wherein said digital data is the multimedia data taught by Sugiyama. The motivation for doing so would have been that automatically downloading digital data without querying the user (para. 38, lines 14–18 of Schroath) provides greater convenience for the user and faster downloads for required digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schroath with Sugiyama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 34 and 52.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Technology Division 2625

JAT
12 June 2007

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER